



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,619	11/07/2001	Arun Kumar	IMRS-364	4188

20028 7590 04/26/2004

LAW OFFICE OF BARRY R LIPSITZ  
755 MAIN STREET  
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

5

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/007,619	KUMAR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Cam-Linh T. Nguyen	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 5 – 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Rassen et al (U.S. 6,189,004).

♦ As per claim 5,

Rassen et al (U.S. 6,189,004) discloses a query for use by a database manager in extracting information from a relational database, comprising:

- "A hub table and a plurality of dimension tables" See col. 9 lines 50 – 56, Rassen. As defined in the disclosure in page 8, the "hub table" includes the more dynamic data, and so is the primary table used in responding to a query. The hub table is called a fact table. Rassen also teaches that the fact table is the central table of a star schema (col. 5, lines 49 – 51). Therefore, the "hub table" corresponds to the "fact table" in Rassen.
- "Each dimension table including a plurality of records each of which includes a plurality of fields, each dimension table related to the hub table by a key field" See col. 5 lines 54 – 59, fig. 3b, table 306, Rassen.
- "The query comprising a select clause in which a field is selected from one of the dimension tables using an alias", and "An alias table". See col. 41, Rassen.

♦ As per claim 6,

In col. 41, Rassen teaches a method of creating the table alias that includes "Order, Date, Customer". These fields are included in the fact table; therefore, the alias is the key field relating the dimension table to the hub table.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1 – 4, 7 - 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rassen et al (U.S. 6,189,004) in view of Cochrane et al (U.S. 6,532,470).

♦ As per claim 1, 7, 10

Rassen et al (U.S. 6,189,004) discloses a method for use by a database manager in extracting information from a relational database, comprising all components claimed in claims 5. Rassen does not clearly disclose the step of "examining the joining query and providing an aliasing list".

However, referring to col. 8 lines 49 - 53, Rassen teaches that the query/reporting information 169 includes filters and form definitions, allowing user to filter different fields, and to indicate which fields a user is particularly interested in. Clearly, the query must be examined in order for the system to select information.

In addition, another example to support the limitation above is provided by Cochrane (U.S. 6,532,470). In Fig. 6, element 176, Cochrane teaches that the query from the user is parsed. Therefore, the query must be examined. Further Cochrane discloses:

- "Providing an alias table" See col.8 lines 43 – 53, col. 17 lines 1 – 10, Cochrane.
- Transforming the joining query into a reduced query" See col. 13 lines 30 – 50, Cochrane.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Cochrane into the system of Rassen, because the combination would provided more accuracy of the query and to make sure that the referenced tables exist (col. 12 lines 20 – 25, Cochrane).

♦ As per claim 2 - 3, 8 – 9, 11,

- "An alias table is created" see col. 17 lines 1 – 10, Cochrane.

- "Providing a final response to the query ... by replacing ... the alias values with the aliased field values using the alias table" See col. 41, Rassen.

♦ As per claim 4,

- "A computer readable medium comprising instructions" See col. 6 line 28 – 43, Rassen, col. 5 lines 48 – 62, Cochrane.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Richard Hans Harvey (U.S. 6,052,681) discloses a X.500 system and methods.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Linh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305- 1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703- 746- 7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703- 305- 3900.

  
**WAYNE AMSBURY**  
**PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**

LN